DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 688 SP 024 081

AUTHOR	Sikula, John P.; Roth, Robert A.
TITLE	Teacher Preparation and Certification: The Call for Reform. Fastback 202.
INSTITUTION	Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, Bloomington, Ind.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-87367-202-X
PUB DATE	84
NOTE	46p.; Publication of this fastback was sponsored by the Louisville, Kentucky Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa and the School of Education at the University of Louisville.
AVAILABLE FROM	Phi Delta Kappa, Eighth and Union, Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402 ($0 75).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accreditation (Institutions); Admission Criteria; Change Agents; *Educational Change; Higher Education; Minimum Competency Testing; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Validation; State Standards; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

This booklet discusses changes taking place in the four major processes involved in preparing and certifying teachers: national accreditation, state program approval, state certification, and teacher preparation. Some of the major issues affecting these processes, such as teacher competency testing and teaching internships, are discussed, and the impact of changes in these four processes are examined. Three specific areas are identified as in need of strengthening: (1) evaluation of teacher preparation programs, including national accreditation and state program approval; (2) requirements for entering and remaining in the profession, including certification regulations and procedures; and (3) preparation of teachers, including program entrance and exit requirements. Case studies are presented of successful reforms in Florida, Oklahoma, and the University of Louisville (Kentucky). (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FASTBACK

202

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Klewer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Teacher Preparation and Certification: The Call for Reform

John P. Sikula, Robert A. Roth

PHI DELTA KAPPA
EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION

JOHN P. SIKULA

ROBERT A. ROTH

John P. Sikula is chairman of the Division of Education at Indiana University Northwest in Gary, Indiana. He is president of the Indiana Association of Teacher Educators and is past president of the Indiana Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. He has served as president of the Toledo Ohio Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa (1975-76) and the Northwest Indiana Chapter (1982-83). In 1981 Phi Delta Kappa selected him as one of 75 "Young Leaders in Education."

Sikula has written and spoken extensively about teacher education. He has received awards for Distinguished Achievement and Excellence in Educational Journalism from the Educational Press Association of America, for Outstanding Teacher from the University of Toledo, and for Distinguished Service in Education from the Indiana Association of Teacher Educators. He is editor of *Action in Teacher Education*, the national journal of the Association of Teacher Educators.

Robert A. Roth is currently with Performance Learning Systems in Emerson, New Jersey, and is responsible for the development of the Performance Learning College, a graduate teacher education institution. He was formerly state director of Teacher Preparation and Certification Services in the Michigan State Department of Education. Roth is the past president of the Association of Teacher Educators, past president of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, and a former chairperson of the Interstate Certification Agreement. He has also been president of the Michigan Association of Teacher Educators and the Michigan State Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa.

Series Editor, Derek L. Burleson

Teacher Preparation and Certification: The Call for Reform

by
John P. Sikula
and
Robert A. Roth

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 83-83084
ISBN 0-87367-202-X
Copyright © 1984 by the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation
Bloomington, Indiana

This fastback is sponsored by the Louisville Kentucky Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa and the School of Education at the University of Louisville, which made a generous contribution toward publication costs.

The two organizations sponsor this fastback in memory of

J. J. Oppenheimer

who left a rich legacy of dedication to teaching and love of learning.

Table of Contents

Introduction 7

The Call for Reform 8

Reforms in National Accreditation 16

Reforms in State Program Approval 23

Reforms in State Certification 27
- Examinations 27
- Internships 29
- Certificate Renewal 29

Reforms in Teacher Preparation 31

Case Studies of Successful Reforms 35
- Florida 35
- Oklahoma 36
- University of Louisville 37

Will the Reforms Make a Difference? 39

Bibliography 42

Introduction

Teacher education has been the subject of much criticism since the 1960s, but only within the last few years have numerous reform proposals addressed the major issue of how to provide for quality in teacher education. The improvement of schooling in this country ultimately depends on improving the preparation and certification of school personnel, so that those who enter and remain in the teaching profession are competent. To achieve this, three specific areas need to be strengthened:

- The evaluation of teacher preparation programs, including national accreditation and state program approval;
- The requirements for entering and remaining in the profession, including certification regulations and procedures; and
- The preparation of teachers, including program entrance and exit requirements.

This fastback will discuss changes taking place in the four major processes involved in preparing and certifying school teachers: national accreditation, state program approval, state certification, and teacher preparation. These are in transition today. Some of the major issues affecting these processes, such as teacher competency testing and teaching internships, will be discussed, and the impact of changes in these four processes will be examined.

The Call for Reform

A widespread call for reform in teacher preparation and certification has come about because of increasing evidence that education majors are not as academically able today as they have been in the past. For example, the national average Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) combined verbal and mathematical score is 893, while the average score for education majors is 813. In every state the 1982 SAT scores for high school seniors who indicate education as their intended major fell below those entering the arts; business; commerce and communications; and the biological, physical, and social sciences. Although there has been a gradual decline of SAT scores among students in most fields of study, the decline for education majors in the last several years has been most dramatic.

The problem is more severe than declining SAT scores. Several studies have pointed to lack of rigor in admission criteria used by teacher preparation programs and to declining academic ability among beginning teachers. Studies in Texas, North Carolina, and elsewhere have concluded that the academic ability of beginning teachers is becoming a serious problem. Studies in the mid-1970s indicated that most institutions denied admission to less than 10% of the applicants to teacher preparation programs. The criteria used for admittance were often biographical data and interest measures. And once admitted to programs, students were seldom screened out. These findings have disturbed many people, including politicians, who are not unmindful of the large number of votes associated with issues involving education and schooling. For example, at the 1980 Democratic Convention the largest

bloc of delegates and alternates was controlled by the National Education Association (NEA), which represents some 1.7 million school employees.

Education is back on the national agenda. In 1983 a number of national reports on education received widespread media attention. Several of these reports called on the federal government to take more active leadership in resolving problems associated with schooling and teacher quality. The Twentieth Century Fund Task Force report is a good example. The report demanded that the federal government take the lead in ensuring that public school students acquire the knowledge and skills for effective participation in a democratic society, arguing that the federal government is in the best position to focus public attention on the vital importance of quality in schools. The report also made specific recommendations for federal action to reward outstanding teachers with both recognition and incentives to remain in school, and to ensure the availability of advanced training in science and math.

In April 1983 the National Commission on Excellence in Education issued an open letter to the American people titled *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. This report, and the publicity surrounding it, has given increased impetus to some changes that have been suggested by many educators for years. The Commission recommended, for example, that:

- Schools, colleges, and universities adopt more rigorous and measurable standards and higher expectations for academic performance and student conduct;
- Four-year colleges and universities raise their requirements for admission; and
- Persons preparing to teach be required to meet high educational standards, to demonstrate an aptitude for teaching, and to demonstrate competence in an academic discipline.

The commission made popular several facts known to educators for some time. For example, the report stated that:

- Not enough academically able students are attracted to teaching;
- Teacher preparation programs need substantial improvement;

- The professional working conditions of teachers are, on the whole, unacceptable;
- The average salary of teachers is well below that of other people with equivalent training and experience; and
- Many teachers are required to supplement their incomes with part-time and summer employment.

This report and others dramatized teacher salary inadequacies. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reports that the average starting salaries for teachers are about 25% less than starting salaries for accountants and 40% less than those for computer scientists. A teacher with a master's degree will make 44% less than an engineer with a master's degree. According to the NEA, the 1981-82 average teacher salary of $19,142 is more than $6,000 below what the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics considers a moderate budget for a family of four. Other 1983 reports have indicated that the average teacher's salary nationwide is about $20,500 a year, but average teachers' salaries in two-thirds of the states are below this amount. According to the August 1983 Carnegie Foundation report, teachers' salaries have slipped from 49% of total state funds for elementary and secondary education in 1972-73 to 38% a decade later.

A Nation At Risk was followed by reports from the College Board, the American Council on Education, and several other prominent groups. However, long before any of these reports was released, major studies and countless journal articles addressed problems in teacher education. In fact, almost every major organization related to teacher education has developed proposals for change.

In addition to the general calls for reform, a number of proposals have focused more specifically on national accreditation, program approval, state certification, and teacher preparation. In these four areas, proposals are more comprehensive and detailed than the general recommendations in the recent national reports, and they have generated considerable interest among teacher educators.

A comprehensive call for reform, *The Need For Quality*, was issued by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) in 1981. A consortium of 14 Southern states, SREB was established by interstate compact

in 1949 to review issues, make recommendations, and provide leadership in education. An overriding concern of the SREB report is to improve teacher salaries. The report contains 25 recommendations, 14 of which are pertinent to teacher preparation. Those 14 recommendations are:

1. States should develop tighter standards for admission into teacher preparation programs, conduct performance evaluations of all beginning teachers, and require tests for certification with specified passing scores.
2. The need for a regional assessment of teacher selection techniques should be studied.
3. The 14 SREB states should use a common test to aid interstate migration of teachers.
4. State boards of education and state boards of higher education in each state should evaluate teacher education programs, eliminate unnecessary duplication, and consolidate programs.
5. States should require coordination between schools and teacher education programs and sustained student exposure to the classroom beginning with the junior year.
6. Certification should be less rigid; and all beginning teachers, including arts and sciences graduates, should be given provisional certification.
7. States should develop an array of incentives to attract science and math teachers.
8. Certification requirements should permit graduates in mathematics and science who lack professional education degrees to teach at the secondary levels.
9. A panel of school, college, and business personnel should be convened to consider improvements in the development of effective school leaders.
10. Certification and education courses for vocational classes should be analyzed to determine if they are actually needed.
11. State laws should tie salary increments and recertification to graduate education or staff development that is locally derived, state approved, and meets teacher and school needs.

12. Staff development funding for local schools should be increased.

13. Service to schools should be recognized by colleges in promoting faculty.

14. State boards should review teacher education, strengthen continuing education, and review the accreditation system.

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Certification, Preparation, and Accreditation submitted a revised report to the Council in November 1983. The report, based on surveys of the states, is divided into four sections dealing with attracting, preparing, licensing, and retaining teachers and contains more than 20 recommendations related to these areas. Citing "a national emergency in teaching," the report recommends the following in relation to teacher preparation and licensing:

- Standards for teacher training should be strengthened through state program approval;
- Preparation programs should be balanced; current programs for elementary teachers are overgeneralized and programs for secondary teachers are overspecialized;
- Teacher training programs should be extended with the increased time devoted to learning pedagogy and self-evaluation;
- Policies for improving programs should be accomplished through cooperative efforts and include approval of competency-based programs;
- States should support programs that provide opportunity for talented individuals who do not complete teacher preparation programs to be prepared to teach;
- States with life certificates should provide for periodic review as a condition for continuing certification;
- Teachers should be required to participate in staff development as a condition for continued certification;
- States should develop alternative approaches for certifying persons who desire to enter teaching;
- Accreditation standards should be strengthened to achieve

comparability of programs among states in order to promote certification reciprocity.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) provided a model for improving teacher preparation in *Educating a Profession: Profile of a Beginning Teacher*, published in 1983. The document proposes four components for an initial teacher preparation program: general education, pre-professional study in subject areas related to teaching (psychology), academic specialization, and professional study.

In 1982 NEA issued its call for reform in *Excellence in Our Schools, Teacher Education: An Action Plan*. NEA maintains that the expertise of the practicing teacher has been missing from teacher education. Programs should have more rigorous criteria for admission and graduation, have substantial opportunities for practice, and be approved on the basis of standards derived from the practice of teaching. The major portion of the document describes standards for state approval of teacher preparation programs, criteria for compliance, and evidence questions for each standard. It also describes the composition and responsibilities of an autonomous professional standards board, of which the majority of members would be teachers.

In September 1981 representatives of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) testified on teacher education and retention before the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education. The AFT submitted a document that addresses the need for improving the competence of the teaching force, accreditation, teacher education programs, teacher certification and licensure, and inservice and professional development. Because minimal salaries, low prestige, and poor working conditions are probable causes of education's failure to attract bright students into the profession, the AFT document states that entrance standards for teacher preparation programs must be developed and strongly enforced. The AFT, however, opposes admissions quotas and extended programs.

The AFT proposed that a practicum be required of students as soon as they enter the teacher preparation program, which would require much greater collaboration between schools of education and the public schools. A one- to two-year internship prior to permanent certification

was also supported by the AFT, as was the use of a written examination that tests the level of literacy, knowledge of subject matter, and pedagogy to qualify for entrance into the profession and prior to acceptance into a teacher internship program.

The Education Commission of the States (ECS), a nonprofit organization formed by interstate compact to further working relationships among governors, state legislators, and educators, issued a 1982 report titled "Raising Teacher Quality Levels." Recognizing that there are serious problems, ECS recommended the examination of minimum salary schedules and suggested that solutions depend on funding. A related issue is whether to target state funds for salaries for certain kinds of teachers.

ECS recommended tougher admission standards for teacher education, a screen or test before certification, an internship prior to certification, different levels of certification in the initial teaching years, and renewal of certification at specified intervals. The ECS report also recommended that grants, scholarships, or low-interest loans be given to high-quality teacher candidates and that schools of education be held accountable by a state board or commission that would monitor institutional performance and establish controls. New funding formulas for schools of education may need to be devised, according to the report.

The Educational Testing Service (ETS), a private nonprofit organization that is active in teacher testing through the National Teachers Examination, published a call for reform titled "Teacher Competence" in a 1982 issue of *Focus*. This monograph referred to a crisis of competence, the diminishing talent pool, the salary gap, stress in the profession, and the fact that many critics believe the problem is deeply rooted in the way teachers are trained. A conclusion was that many of our current bright teachers will soon leave the profession and it will be filled with a generation of ill-prepared students.

ETS, while recognizing that higher salaries are the key to attracting top people to teaching, recommended higher admission standards and tougher curricula in teacher education schools. A major thesis of the monograph was that five-year programs and other quality innovations may attract brighter undergraduates and that a rigorous teacher education program would draw quality students.

The issue in all of these calls for reform is how to improve the quality of teachers. Although the various recommendations are wide ranging, a number of suggestions appear in several reports. Recommendations most frequently cited are examinations for teachers, improved selection and admission criteria, accreditation, evaluation of teacher education programs, coordination of programs between schools and teacher education programs, recruiting highly capable individuals, increased teacher salaries, internships, extended programs, and improved state funding for teacher education programs.

Although we are witnessing a new wave of reform in teacher education, many of the current suggestions for reform are not new. What is new is the recognition that reform cannot be limited to one level of schooling or to one segment of society. School, university, business, and political officials are now realizing that they must work together to improve several facets of teaching simultaneously, from selection and admission criteria to increased salaries and professional development of master teachers. Improvement will take time and effort, and it will cost money. Education has become a national issue; it now will have to become a national priority. For this we can thank not just the critics but, more importantly, those groups and organizations that have developed proposals and legislation to address specific problems. Also, grassroots educators are finally getting more involved in pressing for changes. This is a healthy situation and one that might finally lead to changing some basic societal priorities.

Reforms in National Accreditation

One way to improve the quality of teachers is to strengthen the national accreditation standards used in evaluating teacher education programs.

There are two main types of accreditation: regional and program. Regional accreditation evaluates the adequacy of a college or university as a whole. Regional accrediting associations look at an institution's objectives, program, financial sources, faculty, library, and other features and make a determination as to the adequacy of the institution in meeting established standards. For the purposes of regional accreditation, the country is divided into six regions: New England, Middle States, North Central, Southern, Northwest, and Western. Since regional accreditation does not focus specifically on teacher education, it has not received attention in the reform proposals.

Program accreditation, also referred to as professional accreditation, concentrates on specific professional fields such as medicine, law, nursing, theology, business, optometry, and teacher education. Program accreditation is national in the sense that the standards for accrediting a program are the same across the country.

Program accreditation in teacher education is the responsibility of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). NCATE's *Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education* are used to evaluate teacher preparation programs. The process for using NCATE's *Standards* has been in place for several years. The general steps in the process are:

1. An institution requests that its teacher education program be considered for initial accreditation or reaccreditation.

2. After receiving the necessary materials and instructions from NCATE, the institution conducts a self-study and prepares an institutional report. The self-study usually starts about 18 months before the visit by the NCATE team. The institutional report is developed according to NCATE *Standards*.

3. The dates for the visit are set.

4. The institutional report is due 60 days before the visiting team inspects the program.

5. About 30 days before the visit, the visiting team chairman visits the campus to check on the adequacy of the institutional report and the availability of needed supporting data and persons and to make preparations for the visit.

6. The visiting team is on campus for three days. During this period the team validates the institutional report and assesses the strengths and weaknesses of the various programs through interviews and examination of records and other data. The team prepares a report that summarizes strengths and weaknesses related to the *Standards* and the degree to which each standard is met.

7. Within 21 days after the visit, the final team report is edited and sent to the NCATE office, which in turn forwards copies to the institution.

8. The institution has 21 days to prepare a response to the team report. This gives the institution an opportunity to note in writing any inaccuracies, misleading statements, or other inadequacies.

9. Copies of the institutional report, the team report, and the institutional response are sent to NCATE for consideration at its next meeting.

NCATE accreditation follows a seven-year cycle. During the fifth year of the cycle, the institution prepares an update of its earlier institutional report and a visit is made by a team of two to four members. Following the visit, the team prepares a report and recommends either 1) extension of the current accreditation period for five additional years before a full-scale visit is held or 2) that an evaluation based on a new in-

stitutional report be conducted in the seventh year as previously scheduled. The latter recommendation must be based on weaknesses documented by the team.

Within the last few years, there have been increasing complaints about the NCATE process. The process is costly and there is some question as to its value. Some teacher educators have concluded that accreditation by NCATE is not very important for the employment of graduates.

A 1980 study titled *NCATE: Does It Matter?*, published by the Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT) at the Michigan State University College of Education, reported that:

- The NCATE approach determines only if tasks are performed, not if they are performed well;
- NCATE *Standards* are vague, key terms are undefined, and the evidence suggested to demonstrate standards is insufficient;
- *Standards* are applied inconsistently;
- NCATE's effect on program quality is limited because its power base of professional authority is weaker than the economic or legal authority exercised by other "levers of power" that affect professional preparation programs.

However, the IRT and other studies do recognize some of NCATE's strengths. In particular, they recognize that:

- The NCATE process generally uncovers problems in inferior programs (as judged by NCATE *Standards*);
- The process is conducted in a professional and objective manner in which participants take responsibilities seriously; and
- Institutions tend to modify their programs to be in compliance with NCATE *Standards*.

In *A Proposed Accreditation System*, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Committee on Accreditation Alternatives summarized the concerns about NCATE:

- The *Standards* lack clarity;
- Some *Standards* are inappropriate (are more like preconditions)

and ignore critical factors (for example, student-faculty ratios and other indicators of how the resource base is deployed);

- Team size is too large;
- Team composition is based more on organizational representation than on experience, skill, and understanding of the type of institution being visited;
- NCATE reviews are redundant since institutions are also subject to required state reviews, and articulation is lacking between NCATE and state review standards;
- The costs involved are excessive for a voluntary review; and
- Not enough distinction is made between initial accreditation and reaccreditation in terms of the materials prepared, the scope of the visit, and the criteria applied.

Although the NCATE process is costly and its *Standards* need refinement, NCATE is still likely to remain an active force in teacher education for years to come. In fact, if economic constraints continue in education, the influence of NCATE may increase as weaker programs go out of business.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) recognizes that reforms in teacher preparation and certification will require some changes being made in NCATE processes and *Standards*. Its Task Force on Accreditation Alternatives has developed an alternative to the current NCATE system. The principles of the AACTE proposal are listed below.

Principle 1: Accreditation decisions should be made for the teacher education unit. "Unit" is defined as the administrative structure directly responsible for policy and implementation of professional education programs leading to initial certification of teachers and other professional school personnel as well as advanced programs. A unit is normally a school, college, or department of education (SCDE). Of course, in assessing the quality of units, programs will have to be evaluated and weighed against standards, as has been done in the past; but the suggestion here is that approval be given for entire units instead of individual programs. Under this plan, different programs within the same unit would not receive independent accreditation.

Principle 2: Continuing accreditation should replace the current concept of reaccreditation. Currently, NCATE accreditation follows a seven-year cycle, with an evaluation during the fifth year of the cycle that leads to either five additional years before a full-scale visit or a visit in the seventh year as previously scheduled. The AACTE recommendation calls for a distinction to be made between the processes for seeking initial accreditation and those for continuing accreditation. Elaborate institutional reports would be required only for initial visits, and annual reports and updates of the institutional report would replace the present reports for continuing accreditation reviews. The AACTE believes that annual monitoring of data would ensure that accredited teacher education units maintain high quality. Every three years an NCATE audit committee would review data-bank information for evidence of continued accreditation, and every six years a review team would study the information and an updated institutional report and would visit the campus.

Principle 3: Articulation between state approval and national accreditation needs to be improved. Currently, this articulation may or may not be present. The recommendation is for states, not NCATE, to focus on individual programs leading to certification. National accreditation should focus on the professional education unit.

Principle 4: Visiting team members should be selected from a board of examiners whose members are skilled in evaluation and trained in NCATE processes and standards. These board members would serve three-year terms and would participate in two or three campus visits per year. They would be drawn equally from NEA, AACTE, and other NCATE constituent members; and their selection would be based on demonstrated expertise in teacher education, teaching, research, and evaluation. Teams for initial campus visits would average five members, and sixth-year teams would have three members. This recommendation cuts the size of visitation teams significantly since current teams range from six to fifteen members, depending on the size of the institution and the number of programs to be evaluated.

Principle 5: Five unit-focused standards would replace the current six sets of standards for basic and advanced programs. The recommendation here is to eliminate sub-standards within families of standards and

the overlap between basic and advanced categories. The new standards would focus on more generic characteristics of teacher education programs and the institutional context within which they operate. The basic goal would be to determine the overall quality of the units' efforts in:

1. Operation and Resources
   - the unit's leadership, membership, and functions and the unit's relationship to other campus units
   - faculty responsibility for formulating curricula and for selection, retention, and promotion of its members
   - administrative structure to accomplish the above
   - fiscal and physical resources and fiscal support as compared with state, regional, and national norms
   - commitments to multicultural education and affirmative action as well as activities designed to make students aware of racism, ageism, sexism, handicaps, and other obstacles to educational opportunity

2. Faculty
   - number of faculty
   - faculty scholarship and service to the profession

3. Students
   - process by which the unit assesses the quality of its programs and uses that information
   - screening for the profession through admissions, retention, and graduation standards
   - admissions flexibility by which established norms may be waived for special cases, experimental programs, or unique enrollment profiles to show that high standards of professional competence are maintained

4. Knowledge Base
   - preparation programs for professional school personnel used to assess the quality of the unit
   - education research findings as the bases of curricula, instruction, and practice
   - theories underlying programs

5. Relationship to Practice
   - program's relationship with conditions in schools, and incorporation of practitioners' expertise
   - relationships with schools, professional organizations, teacher associations, and other agencies
   - efforts to minimize the gap between theory and practice

Principle 6: The AACTE further recommends that the NCATE Annual List, a listing of NCATE accredited programs, be expanded to include a description of the accredited units and data to indicate the support level for professional education programs. This expanded list would also include a statement of the characteristics of units and programs.

NCATE is currently working to incorporate these AACTE principles into the NCATE system. Of course, changes made in the national accreditation process and *Standards* will not necessarily result in better teachers or practice; but if they are implemented in conjunction with changes in other processes affecting the preparation of teachers, then the likelihood of improvement in the quality of teachers and schools increases. A comprehensive approach is needed.

Reforms in State Program Approval

Programs for the preparation of teachers are evaluated by state regulations and program approval standards, which results in granting or denying authorization to recommend teaching certificates or endorsements or to grant credit toward these. State program approval usually refers to evaluation of a higher education institution's teacher preparation program, but programs offered by local districts for certification credit also require state approval.

State program approval is mandatory. Institutions cannot offer certification programs or credit for certification purposes without this state approval. The state has the legal authority for this approval, which is conducted to protect the public interest.

State approval of teacher preparation programs requires each program to be approved in the certification area to which it relates. Program approval standards thus have a direct influence on the teacher preparation curriculum and the quality of the graduate. The reform of state program approval is therefore an important part of upgrading teacher preparation.

All states have some type of procedure for approving programs. However, according to a 1979 survey by the Interstate Certification Project, Montana, Michigan, Nevada, and North Dakota do not have a requirement for periodic, on-site evaluation.

Serious questions have been raised about the effectiveness of state program review. Generally, the state sends an evaluation team that recommends approval status to the state board or state commission,

23

which makes the actual decision. In some instances politics dictate the ultimate decision, and it is very rare when an institution is denied state approval. Legislators may, in effect, require that institutions in their districts not be put out of business. This is a fundamental weakness in state program approval. On the other hand, many significant improvements result when a strong review process is in place.

A number of changes are being proposed to strengthen state program approval. One such effort is required examinations for all program graduates. The results of the examinations are part of the data used to evaluate the teacher education institution and its programs. Florida requires that a state approved program must have 80% or more of its graduates passing a certification examination, or the college will lose its approved program status. Use of examinations for program approval has been approved in concept by the Michigan State Board of Education. Although there has been some discussion regarding the need for program approval if examinations are required, at this point it appears that examinations may become part of the program approval process.

Another effort to strengthen state program approval is a proposal by the Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities (TECSCU). This group suggests that state program approval systems themselves should be evaluated or accredited by some external agency. Standards would be established to determine the effectiveness of state systems. This proposal is not likely to be pursued because states strongly protect their legal authority in this domain. However, a professional influence could be exercised by an organization such as the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), but no such effort is currently underway.

Perhaps the most significant current activity to reform state program approval is the effort by the NEA described in *Excellence In Our Schools, Teacher Education: An Action Plan*, which proposes a set of standards for approving teacher education programs. NEA is working with 10 state affiliates to pursue the implementation of the proposed standards and to ensure that the state program approval systems meet these standards. The states are Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Texas, and Virginia. This effort is only in its initial stages.

The NEA standards for approving programs are divided into five categories: 1) program planning, 2) program implementation, 3) program personnel, 4) program content, and 5) membership in the profession. Each category contains standards with criteria for compliance and evidence questions. An example of one standard for program planning is:

Standard: The purpose of the program is to prepare beginning teachers to function effectively when beginning practice.

Criteria for Compliance

1. The stated goals of the program, as evidenced in the plan, are to prepare beginning teachers to function effectively.
2. The objectives of the program, derived from the goals, include providing field-based experiences and ways to apply the knowledge base to classroom activities.
3. The program includes providing content and skills which teachers have identified as being necessary for beginning practice.

Evidence Questions

1. Does the plan include classroom application strategies accompanying each set of learnings offered?
2. Does the plan include opportunities to practice what is being taught?
3. Does the plan include sequenced field-based experiences throughout the program?
4. Does the plan provide for education students to participate in direct classroom activities throughout the program?
5. Does the plan identify the number of teachers (and their specialty areas) and the teacher organizations the college of education consulted with in developing the plan?

The NEA states that teacher education programs should be approved at two levels: nationally, through NCATE, and at the state level, through an agency such as a professional standards board. The national system is concerned with broader issues (facilities, resources, personnel, etc.), and the state system reviews the program content to ensure that

beginning teachers have the capability to begin practice within that state.

The NEA calls for the establishment in each state of a legally autonomous agency such as a professional standards board, with teachers who are NEA members constituting the majority of the board. The powers of the board as described in *Excellence in Our Schools* provide for fiscal independence and direct reporting to the legislature.

This NEA proposal could have a significant impact on state program approval standards, procedures, and governance, depending on the influence of the NEA affiliate in each state. The impact is likely to be greater on changes in standards and procedures, which are content quality issues, than on governance, which is a political issue.

Reforms in State Certification

Each state has the legal authority to license or certify an individual to teach in the elementary and secondary schools. Certification verifies that an individual has satisfactorily completed the requirements for a given certificate and ensures the public that only properly trained people are allowed to instruct children and youth. Completion of the courses and experiences specified in certification requirements is assumed to be sufficient evidence of ability to teach. In most states certificates must be renewed; advanced certificates are granted by completing additional coursework.

Teacher certification is undergoing considerable revision to improve the quality of those who enter and remain in the profession. Almost all state certification systems are in some state of flux, but at least 26 states have recently initiated major reforms in teacher certification. The reforms receiving considerable attention are examinations, internships, and certificate renewal.

Examinations

The 1981 Gallup Poll revealed that 84% of those surveyed believe that teachers should be required to pass a state examination in the subject they will teach. J.T. Sandefur, dean of the College of Education at Western Kentucky University, has studied the practice of teacher competency examinations and concludes that it is growing rapidly. He found that very little testing of teachers was done until 1977, when a Louisiana statute prescribed an examination in English proficiency, pedagogical

knowledge, and knowledge of subject area specialization for purposes of certification. In 1978 Florida and Georgia began to develop programs; six more states took action in 1979; five more in 1980; and six more in 1981. In 1982 nine additional states joined the movement. In 1982, 27 states had either legislative or state department mandates for state competency tests for teachers, and nine states reported serious study of such action.

Tests mandated by the states vary in their purpose. Some are used for admission to teacher preparation programs, some to determine eligibility for a teaching certificate. Sandefur's survey indicates that 21 states test or plan to test applicants for admission to teacher preparation programs in order to ensure competency in basic communication and computational skills.

Twenty-eight states test or plan to test teacher candidates prior to the issuance of a certificate. This type of test, sometimes referred to as an "exit examination," has received much attention in the media and is mentioned in many of the reform proposals reviewed earlier in this fastback. The purpose of this type of test is to ensure that those who enter the teaching profession have the basic knowledge in those areas considered fundamental to effective teaching. Such tests cover basic skills (communication and mathematics skills), professional knowledge (teaching), and academic proficiency (subject area specialization). Sandefur's study shows 27 states test or plan to test basic skills; 21 test or plan to test professional skills; 20 test or plan to test academic skills; 15 states require tests both for admission to teacher education programs and prior to certification.

A variety of tests are being used for these purposes. Seventeen states are using or considering using nationally standardized tests such as the National Teachers Examination (NTE), the American College Test (ACT), the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), or the California Achievement Test (CAT). According to the Sandefur study, 16 states have or are developing their own tests, the most notable being the tests developed in Georgia and Florida.

Another variety of testing is in the form of state-level teacher performance evaluation policies. Lou M. Carey indicates that 27 states have state-level policies for the evaluation of teachers. The extent to

which these are related to certification was not reported. Sandefur, however, reported on-the-job assessment of performance for certification in 10 states. These on-the-job evaluations usually occur during internship programs.

Internships

Another movement to strengthen the state certification process is the internship program. The internship is intended to provide support for new teachers in their initial year (or years) in order to ensure a smooth transition into full-time practice, to provide opportunities for further professional development, and to assess the skill level of beginning teachers. Sixteen states are studying or have implemented internship programs as part of the teacher certification system. The American Federation of Teachers adopted a position statement at its annual convention in 1982 that provides for a one- to two-year internship in order to receive a permanent certificate.

Internship programs (sometimes called induction or beginning teacher programs) usually involve a regular full-time assignment with salaries at the first-year level. An intern certificate may be issued for this period. The intern is provided support and is assessed by another teacher or a team such as an administrator, teacher, and university representative. A regular certificate is issued after completion of the internship and a successful evaluation. Internship programs vary from state to state.

Certificate Renewal

Renewal of certificates or recertification has been the target of reform because of the perceived need to revitalize the existing instructional work force, which has a higher average age than 10 years ago. In 1970 almost 17% of all teachers were under 25, but by 1980 only about 8% were under 25. The median age in 1976 was 33; in 1981 it was 37.

The trend in certification is for states to move away from permanent certification toward periodic renewals and even optional ways to renew certificates. Some states, such as Minnesota, are allowing alternatives to graduate credits for renewal. Inservice education of teachers has been

undergoing a radical shift in the last several years, away from university programs to state and local programs for teacher recertification. A study by Michael D. Rowls and Madlyn L. Hanes found that of the 36 states responding, only 25% required college courses for recertification, and 33% allowed renewal requirements to be met solely by attending school district activities and programs. One-sixth of those responding required teachers to participate in both district-conducted activities and college coursework. Rowls and Hanes report clear evidence of a national trend toward local school districts assuming a major role in teacher professional development and recertification.

30

Reforms in Teacher Preparation

The teacher preparation curriculum is influenced significantly by state standards; and as these standards have changed, so have the standards utilized by most teacher preparation programs themselves. The preparation programs are generally considered to be the training arm of the profession, the point at which theory and standards are translated into practice and procedures. This is where changes are needed if teachers are to improve their skills.

An AACTE survey of schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs), published in the July/August 1983 *Briefs*, indicated that SCDEs were:

- raising standards for students entering teacher education programs;
- changing some program components and structure;
- strengthening program evaluation;
- offering faculty and staff development activities; and
- coordinating with field-based educators and with educators from other academic disciplines on campus.

The survey indicated that if school quality is to improve, SCDEs cannot concern themselves merely with their own students, program, and faculty. They must also increase student interest in teacher education; maintain "field specific" balance in teacher supply and demand; educate the public; and force low quality institutions out of teacher preparation.

According to the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (7 September 1983), during the last five years 85% of SCDEs have taken steps to improve the quality of their teacher education programs. About 75% have raised their entrance requirements. The California State University system, for example, recently approved a policy that called for the 19 campuses to make admission to education programs more rigorous, to require teacher candidates to demonstrate competence in subject matter and basic skills, and to develop a two-step teaching credential with a provisional certificate for beginners and full professional credentials for experienced teachers.

The direction of change in teacher preparation programs in the last few years has been clear. Across the nation the entrance and exit requirements for teacher preparation programs are becoming more rigorous. In the 1960s and early 1970s the concerns were quantitative, i.e., producing the large number of teachers needed in the schools. Now the situation is much different. The concerns are qualitative and control mechanisms are being implemented.

Entrance requirement changes in Indiana are typical. In Indiana there are four major state universities and about 30 smaller colleges and universities that prepare teachers. In all four major state institutions (Ball State University, Indiana State University, Indiana University, and Purdue University), and most of the smaller programs as well, the entrance requirements for teacher education programs have been stiffened since Rules 46-47 became effective in 1982. Rules 46-47, which were adopted and promulgated by the Indiana State Board of Education Commission on Teacher Training and Licensing, require all teacher preparation programs to provide early and continuing field experiences. Individual programs are encouraged to be innovative and to reflect unique institutional approaches while still meeting state minimum requirements. Coursework in reading and additional work in written and oral communication are required for all teachers. In effect, the entire state teacher preparation system was revised. Since then, different institutions have gone even further to upgrade their own program standards and expectations.

At Ball State, a GPA of 2.4 is required to enter the elementary education curriculum; the old standard was 2.2. Admission into student

teaching now requires a 2.5 GPA (formerly 2.2); while certification in elementary education now requires an overall GPA of 2.5 (formerly 2.2) and a 2.7 in professional education courses. Secondary education students need a 2.6 GPA in professional education courses if they are to be recommended for certification.

At Indiana State University a 2.2 overall GPA is required of all teacher education graduates (the old standard was 2.0). Students are required to have a 2.2 in subject matter courses with no grade less than a C. In 198[illegible] two new content courses were added to the professional sequence: Multicultural Education and Special Students in Regular Classrooms. The ISU School of Education is also beginning a program to measure student proficiency in math and English.

Indiana University's new teacher education standards became effective in August 1983. Several significant changes were made, including:

- Admission into the teacher education program now requires a 2.3 overall GPA (the previous standard was 2.0);
- Students are now required to pass a test of reading and writing;
- Elementary education students are now required to pass a standardized math test;
- A new system to detect unsatisfactory progress is now used to monitor students.

Purdue University has recently raised the GPA required to get into math and special education programs. For entrance and retention in teacher training programs, Purdue is now using a screening procedure for oral expression, speech and hearing, math, and writing. SAT mathematics scores are also used for admission. Students scoring less than 450 on the SAT mathematics section must pass a college-level math course.

Other states have also upgraded teacher preparation programs. New York has an extended student internship requirement. More rigorous entrance requirements for education majors have been legislated in Florida, North Carolina, and Tennessee. Preservice exit examinations and certification tests are now required in such states as Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, New York, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Virginia.

With more stringent teacher preparation requirements, fewer low

quality teaching candidates will enter the programs and graduates should have better skills. For example, at Northern Illinois University, one of the five largest teacher preparation institutions in the nation, all students planning to major in education are required to pass the locally developed Basic Skills Competency Test. Since May 1982, more than 1,200 students have taken the test, but only 67% of those students have passed it.

These examples of changing entrance requirements are representative of what is going on across the country. Teacher educators are working to improve teacher training standards, to increase the quality of graduates, and to improve practice in schools.

Case Studies of Successful Reforms

To illustrate the various reform activities now going on, this section presents case studies of two state systems and a university program. Although no one state or institution is pursuing all of the reforms identified, some have incorporated several of these reforms into their systems.

Florida

Legislation passed in 1978 and in subsequent years has established several new components in Florida's teacher education system. Institutions must provide early field experiences and improve their admissions, counseling, and retention policies. Florida also requires a score at the 40th percentile in basic skills on a nationally standardized college entrance examination (for example, 835 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test) as a minimum requirement for students entering a teacher education program. Since instituting this basic skills requirement, there has been a 25% overall decline in the number of students entering teacher preparation and a 92% decline in the number of minority students.

All teacher candidates seeking certification must demonstrate mastery of essential generic and specialized teaching competencies on a written examination. The examination covers competency in reading, writing, and fundamental math concepts; comprehending patterns of physical, social, and academic development in students; and recognizing the needs of exceptional students. The written examination must be taken by a teacher education major prior to graduation.

At least 80% of the graduates of a teacher education program must pass the Florida Teacher Certification Examination or the college will lose its approved program status. In 1983 Florida withdrew approval from 38 teacher preparation programs at 18 colleges and universities because less than 80% of their graduates passed the exam.

Teaching certificates in Florida are now limited to five years. Certificates may be renewed for five years after completion of appropriate additional study.

Another important component of the Florida system is the internship/beginning teacher program, which became effective 1 July 1982. A requirement for the initial regular teaching certificate is successful completion of a one-year beginning teacher program. Three years of satisfactory out-of-state teaching experience may be substituted for the beginning teacher program. The purpose of the program is to provide a set of supervised support services for first-year teachers, to assist them in their professional development, and to verify satisfactory performance of state-identified generic teaching competencies.

A *Beginning Teacher Performance Measurement System Handbook* is being developed to provide standardized procedures for conducting systematic observations and performance evaluations. Research on teacher effectiveness is being integrated with the Florida generic teaching competencies. Also formative (for spotting specific weaknesses) and summative (for identifying immediate needs) evaluation instruments are being developed.

Oklahoma

Oklahoma's reform effort is embodied in legislation (H.B. 1706), which became fully effective in February 1982. It calls for: 1) raising the standards for admission to colleges of education, 2) requiring competency examinations in subject areas before graduation, 3) mandating an entry-year internship prior to certification, 4) monitoring the beginning teacher's performance by a team representing the profession, and 5) providing for the continuing education of teachers and teacher educators.

H.B. 1706 requires competency in oral and written English and a

minimum GPA for entrance into a teacher education program. All prospective teachers are required to pass an examination appropriate to their teaching specialty or level. They may take the examination as often as they wish, but they may not enter an internship without passing the test.

After graduating and passing the examination, the teacher candidate is granted a license, rather than a certificate, and may serve as an entry-year teacher at full pay and with full responsibilities. During the internship year the teacher is supervised by an entry-year assistance committee composed of a principal, a consulting teacher, and a teacher educator.

Local boards of education must provide a professional development program for teachers and administrators in their districts. Should staff fail to meet the professional development requirements, their contracts may not be renewed or their raises may be denied.

In addition, all full-time college of education faculty members, including the dean, are required to serve once every five years in a state-accredited public school for the equivalent of at least one half-day per week for one semester in responsibilities related to their college teaching fields.

University of Louisville

The teacher preparation program at the University of Louisville has developed reading, writing, and mathematics proficiency standards and tests to be used for admitting candidates into teacher education. At least twelfth-grade proficiency is expected in each of these areas. The program relies on a combination of nationally standardized and locally developed exams to judge competency.

Before admittance into the teacher preparation program, the candidate's basic skills are assessed in oral communication, written communication, reading, and computation. For oral communication skills, a speech course (with a grade of C) or a speech proficiency examination must be passed. Written communication is assessed by asking students to respond in writing to a problem situation. The response is graded by a committee of the School of Education chaired by a professor of English education using the procedures developed by the Educational Testing

Service for evaluating writing samples. A nationally normed test, *Degrees of Reading Power Test*, is used to assess a teacher candidate's reading competencies; and a locally developed math computation test is used to assess computation skills.

In addition to these basic skills, the Undergraduate Standards and Admissions Committee examines other evidence of commitment to the profession, proficiency in human relations, and student flexibility and adaptability in unique situations. Written recommendations, course grades, advisor information, and applicant input are considered. Applicants to the teacher education program must also have a physical exam, a speech test, a vision test, a hearing test, and tuberculosis and VDRL tests. An individual interview with a faculty member is also required.

At the University of Louisville a 2.25 GPA is required for admittance into teacher education. ACT scores are also used, and data collected indicate that the mean score for teacher education students is above the national average.

These reforms at the University of Louisville are part of a larger statewide effort in Kentucky to improve the quality of teaching candidates. The increased standards appear to be having an impact on the quality of candidates in the teacher preparation program. During the 1982-83 academic year, 30% of the applicants were denied entrance into teacher education, while 60% of the students who were accepted had a GPA of 3.0 or above. Both the short-term and long-term effects of these more rigorous standards are positive.

Will the Reforms Make a Difference?

The changes taking place in national accreditation, program approval, state certification, and teacher preparation should help to improve the quality of teachers in schools. But other changes will also have to take place. Salaries will have to increase, and recruitment efforts must be intensified. The National Center for Education Statistics reported that of the college-bound high school seniors in 1980, only 3% of the males and 10% of the females intended to major in education. These percentages are down from 6% for males and 19% for females eight years earlier. According to the 21 September 1983 issue of *Education Week*, the number of students planning to major in education is less than half the number in 1974-75. In 1972-73, 15% of the women who took the SAT planned to be education majors; in 1983 only 6.7% reported that intention. A recent survey of teacher supply and demand (Akin, 1982) reported a decrease of 41% in the number of new elementary teachers and 51% in the number of new secondary teachers between 1970 and 1980.

As teacher standards become more rigorous, the number of teachers being trained will decrease, but the quality will improve. And, as in any supply-and-demand situation, the cost of the product will increase as quality increases and quantity decreases. In this regard, the future looks bright.

State legislatures, state boards and commissions, organizations of colleges, NCATE, and the NEA are all exerting new influences on teacher education program approval. Positive change will likely occur from these efforts, but the most dramatic changes will occur in those

states where the legislature and state education agency have made a commitment, developed a plan, and provided resources. The states in which NEA affiliates are implementing the NEA's *Action Plan* will also experience positive changes if the affiliates are successful in gaining the cooperation of other organizations.

State certification requirements in general are being upgraded across the country. The use of certification examinations and internships, as well as changing policies for renewal of certification, will significantly strengthen state systems. Teacher preparation programs are becoming more rigorous. The trend is clearly toward better screening of the candidates desiring to enter programs, as well as ensuring that graduates have a series of skills and experiences designed to prepare them academically and realistically for classrooms. The changes underway in national accreditation will likely serve to keep better programs in operation while weeding out those that do not come up to the revised standards.

The efforts to improve teacher quality during this period of declining resources are encouraging, refreshing, and courageous. A less vital system easily could have collapsed or have been seriously weakened under the pressure. Ours has not. However, the impact of the changes taking place will need careful study. Several problems exist. The use of examinations, for example, has had a negative impact on the number of minority teachers entering the teaching profession. The 92% decline in Florida among minority students admitted to teacher education because of the basic skills test is an area of concern. In Alabama, 81% of the white students who took the basic professional studies test passed it, while only 43% of the black candidates passed.

Procedures for evaluating interns during beginning teacher programs also present problems. Determining which competencies should be evaluated, the effect of the settings, and methodological problems of reliable observations are areas of concern, although Florida is making strides toward resolving these problems.

Overall, it appears that teacher quality will increase over the years as a result of the current reform efforts. Other incentives to attract quality candidates and increase salaries complement these efforts. The problem of providing high quality teachers for schools is being addressed, and

the changes currently underway will make a difference. With time, the improved quality of teachers in schools will be evident. This will all happen if teacher quality continues to be a high priority not only with teacher educators but also with the majority of people in the country.

Bibliography

Akin, James N. *Teacher Supply/Demand 1982.* Association for School, College and University Staffing survey. Madison, Wisc., 1982.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. *Educating a Profession: Beginning Teacher Preparation.* Washington, D.C., 1983.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. *Educating a Profession: Profile of a Beginning Teacher.* Washington, D.C., 1983.

Carey, Lou M. *State Level Teacher Performance Evaluation Policies.* Syracuse, N.Y.: National Council of States on Inservice Education, undated.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *The Condition of Teaching: A State-by-State Analysis.* Lawrenceville, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Council of Chief State School Officers. *Staffing the Nation's Schools: A National Emergency.* Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Certification, Preparation, and Accreditation. Washington, D.C., November 1983.

Educational Testing Service. "Teacher Competence." *Focus.* Princeton, 1982.

Education Commission of the States. "Raising Teacher Quality Levels." *Issuegram.* Denver, June 1982.

Education Commission of the States. *Action for Excellence, A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools.* Denver, June 1983.

Fry, Betty. "The Florida Beginning Teacher Program Summary Report, 1982." *The FATE Journal* (Spring 1983): 33-42.

Garner, Warren. "Handbook Encourages Innovation, Permits Freedom." *Hoosier Schoolmaster* 16 (Winter 1977): 7-9.

Gubser, Lyn. "Competency Testing and National Accreditation in Teacher Education." *Action in Teacher Education* 1 (Spring/Summer 1979): 21-27.

Kleine, Paul F., and Wisniewski, Richard. "Bill 1706: A Forward Step for Oklahoma." *Phi Delta Kappan* 63 (October 1981): 115-117.

Mendoza, Alicia, and Kossack, Sharon. "The State of Florida: A Case in Governmental Assessment Legislation." *Action in Teacher Education* 3 (Winter 1981-82): 17-23.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. *Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education*. Washington, D.C., 1979.

National Education Association. *Excellence in Our Schools, Teacher Education: An Action Plan*. Washington, D.C., 1982.

Olsen, Hans C. "Accreditation of Teacher Education Is Alive and Kicking." *Action in Teacher Education* 1 (Spring/Summer 1979): 1-10.

Patterson, Anne. "Changes in Teacher Licensing Requirements: An Historical Perspective." *Hoosier Schoolmaster* 16 (Winter 1977): 4-6.

Rauth, Marilyn. *Statement of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO on Teacher Education and Retention*. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, 1981.

Roth, Robert A. "The Redesign of Teacher Education in the United States: External Strategies: Competency Testing and State Program Approval." Paper presented to the International Council on Education for Teaching World Assembly, 12 July 1983, Washington, D.C.

Roth, Robert A. "The Reform of Teacher Education, New Wine in Old Bottles?" Paper presented to the 55th Annual Conference of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, 28 June 1983, San Francisco.

Rowls, Michael D., and Hanes, Madlyn Levine. "Teacher Recertification: The Shift Toward Local Control and Governance." *Journal of Teacher Education* 33 (July/August 1982): 24-28.

Sandefur, J. T. "Teacher Competency Testing: The Public's Mandate." Paper presented to the 55th Annual Conference of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, 28 June 1983, San Francisco.

Scannell, Dale P.; Gardner, William E.; Olsen, Hans C.; Sullivan, Cathy; and Wisniewski, Richard. *A Proposed Accreditation System (An Alternative to the Current NCATE System)*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1983.

"School Salaries Don't Measure Up." *Inside NEA Today* (April 1983):4.

Sikula, John P. "Educational Retrenchment and Quality Education: Not Necessarily Opposing Concepts." *American Secondary Education* 12 (Spring 1983): 11-14.

Sikula, John P. "Will Federal Support to Schools Increase or Decrease in the 1980s?" *Educational Horizons* 62 (Spring 1984).

Southern Regional Education Board. *The Need for Quality*. Atlanta, 1981.

"Survey Reviews Teacher Education Quality Initiatives." *AACTE Briefs* 4 (July/August 1983): 4, 10.

Tom, Alan R. "An Alternative Set of NCATE Standards." *Journal of Teacher Education* 32 (November/December 1981): 48-52.

Tom, Alan R. "Chopping NCATE Standards Down to Size." *Journal of Teacher Education* 31 (November/December 1980): 25-30.

Twentieth Century Fund. *Making the Grade: Report of the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy.* New York, 1983.

Walton, Susan. "Math Scores on S.A.T. Rise; Verbal Scores Drop." *Education Week*, 21 September 1983, p. 5.

Watkins, Beverly T. "Universities Moving to Raise Quality of Education Schools." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 7 September 1983, pp. 1, 14.

"What's Wrong with Our Teachers?" *U.S. News and World Report*, 14 March 1983, p. 39.

Wheeler, Christopher W. *NCATE: Does It Matter?* East Lansing: Michigan State University College of Education, Institute for Research on Teaching, 1980.

PDK Fastback Series Titles

1. Schools Without Property Taxes: Hope or Illusion?
3. Open Education: Promise and Problems
4. Performance Contracting: Who Profits Most?
7. Busing: A Moral Issue
8. Discipline or Disaster?
10. Who Should Go to College?
13. What Should the Schools Teach?
14. How to Achieve Accountability in the Public Schools
19. Sex Differences in Learning to Read
20. Is Creativity Teachable?
22. The Middle School: Whence? What? Whither?
23. Publish: Don't Perish
26. The Teacher and the Drug Scene
29. Can Intelligence Be Taught?
30. How to Recognize a Good School
31. In Between: The Adolescent's Struggle for Independence
37. General Education: The Search for a Rationale
41. Metrication, American Style
43. Motivation and Learning in School
44. Informal Learning
46. Violence in the Schools: Causes and Remedies
47. The School's Responsibility for Sex Education
56. Equity in School Financing: Full State Funding
57. Equity in School Financing: District Power Equalizing
59. The Legal Rights of Students
60. The Word Game: Improving Communications
62. The People and Their Schools: Community Participation
64. The Community as Textbook
65. Students Teach Students
66. The Pros and Cons of Ability Grouping
70. Dramatics in the Classroom: Making Lessons Come Alive
78. Private Schools: From the Puritans to the Present
79. The People and Their Schools
80. Schools of the Past: A Treasury of Photographs
81. Sexism: New Issue in American Education
83. The Legal Rights of Teachers
84. Learning in Two Languages
86. Silent Language in the Classroom
87. Multiethnic Education: Practices and Promises
88. How a School Board Operates
91. What I've Learned About Values Education
92. The Abuses of Standardized Testing
93. The Uses of Standardized Testing
95. Defining the Basics of American Education
96. Some Practical Laws of Learning
97. Reading 1967-1977: A Decade of Change and Promise
99. Collective Bargaining in the Public Schools
100. How to Individualize Learning
101. Winchester: A Community School for the Urbanvantaged
102. Affective Education in Philadelphia
103. Teaching with Film
104. Career Education: An Open Door Policy
105. The Good Mind
106. Law in the Curriculum
107. Fostering a Pluralistic Society Through Multi-Ethnic Education
108. Education and the Brain
109. Bonding: The First Basic in Education
110. Selecting Instructional Materials
111. Teacher Improvement Through Clinical Supervision
112. Places and Spaces: Environmental Psychology in Education
113. Artists as Teachers
114. Using Role Playing in the Classroom
115. Management by Objectives in the Schools
116. Declining Enrollments: A New Dilemma for Educators
117. Teacher Centers—Where, What, Why?
118. The Case for Competency-Based Education
119. Teaching the Gifted and Talented
120. Parents Have Rights, Too!
121. Student Discipline and the Law
122. British Schools and Ours
123. Church-State Issues in Education
124. Mainstreaming: Merging Regular and Special Education
125. Early Field Experiences in Teacher Education
126. Student and Teacher Absenteeism
127. Writing Centers in the Elementary School
128. A Primer on Piaget
129. The Restoration of Standards: The Modesto Plan
130. Dealing with Stress: A Challenge for Educators
131. Futuristics and Education
132. How Parent-Teacher Conferences Build Partnerships
133. Early Childhood Education: Foundations for Lifelong Learning
134. Teaching about the Creation/Evolution Controversy
135. Performance Evaluation of Educational Personnel
136. Writing for Education Journals
137. Minimum Competency Testing
138. Legal Implications of Minimum Competency Testing
139. Energy Education: Goals and Practices
140. Education in West Germany: A Quest for Excellence
141. Magnet Schools: An Approach to Voluntary Desegregation
142. Intercultural Education

(Continued on inside back cover)

See inside back cover for prices.

Fastback Titles *(continued from back cover)*

143. The Process of Grant Proposal Development
144. Citizenship and Consumer Education: Key Assumptions and Basic Competencies
145. Migrant Education: Teaching the Wandering Ones
146. Controversial Issues in Our Schools
147. Nutrition and Learning
148. Education in the USSR
149. Teaching with Newspapers: The Living Curriculum
150. Population, Education, and Children's Futures
151. Bibliotherapy: The Right Book at the Right Time
152. Educational Planning for Educational Success
153. Questions and Answers on Moral Education
154. Mastery Learning
155. The Third Wave and Education's Futures
156. Title IX: Implications for Education of Women
157. Elementary Mathematics: Priorities for the 1980s
158. Summer School: A New Look
159. Education for Cultural Pluralism: Global Roots Stew
160. Pluralism Gone Mad
161. Education Agenda for the 1980s
162. The Public Community College: The People's University
163. Technology in Education: Its Human Potential
164. Children's Books: A Legacy for the Young
165. Teacher Unions and the Power Structure
166. Progressive Education: Lessons from Three Schools
167. Basic Education: A Historical Perspective
168. Aesthetic Education and the Quality of Life
169. Teaching the Learning Disabled
170. Safety Education in the Elementary School
171. Education in Contemporary Japan
172. The School's Role in the Prevention of Child Abuse
173. Death Education: A Concern for the Living
174. Youth Participation for Early Adolescents: Learning and Serving in the Community
175. Time Management for Educators
176. Educating Verbally Gifted Youth
177. Beyond Schooling: Education in a Broader Context
178. New Audiences for Teacher Education
179. Microcomputers in the Classroom
180. Supervision Made Simple
181. Educating Older People: Another View of Mainstreaming
182. School Public Relations: Communicating to the Community
183. Economic Education Across the Curriculum
184. Using the Census as a Creative Teaching Resource
185. Collective Bargaining: An Alternative to Conventional Bargaining
186. Legal Issues in Education of the Handicapped
187. Mainstreaming in the Secondary School: The Role of the Regular Teacher
188. Tuition Tax Credits: Fact and Fiction
189. Challenging the Gifted and Talented Through Mentor-Assisted Enrichment Projects
190. The Case for the Smaller School
191. What You Should Know About Teaching and Learning Styles
192. Library Research Strategies for Educators
193. The Teaching of Writing in Our Schools
194. Teaching and the Art of Questioning
195. Understanding the New Right and Its Impact on Education
196. The Academic Achievement of Young Americans
197. Effective Programs for the Marginal High School Student
198. Management Training for School Leaders: The Academy Concept
199. What Should We Be Teaching in the Social Studies?
200. Mini-Grants for Classroom Teachers
201. Master Teachers
202. Teacher Preparation and Certification: The Call for Reform
203. Pros and Cons of Merit Pay
204. Teacher Fairs: Counterpoint to Criticism
205. The Case for the All-Day Kindergarten
206. Philosophy for Children: An Approach to Critical Thinking
207. Television and Children
208. Using Television in the Curriculum

This fastback and others in the series are made available at low cost through the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, established in 1966 with a bequest from George H. Reavis. The foundation exists to promote a better understanding of the nature of the educative process and the relation of education to human welfare.

Single copies of fastbacks are 75¢ (60¢ to Phi Delta Kappa members). Write to Phi Delta Kappa, Eighth and Union, Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402 for **quantity discounts for any title or combination of titles.**